

# **Exhibit "4"**

PWP. Steve Roberson told Andrew that we had moved the comment portion of the PWP to the performance review section and that his rating would be deferred until *August*, ~~October~~ 1997. He begged Andrew to tell him why he did not want to sign the PWP. Andrew would not comment other than to say that he would take it to the union.

19. I would like to make it clear that there were no changes to the specific areas covered in the PWP presented to Andrew Lopez on May 6, 1997 from that of a standard PWP except to move the comments to the performance review portion and to note that the rating would be deferred due to Andrew Lopez' training status. The fact that changes were made to the interior pages of this particular PWP did not preclude my using the cover page that Andrew Lopez signed on May 5, 1997. The information on the interior pages of a PWP never remains exactly as it was when a PWP is first presented because evaluations are added to the interior pages when the ratings are done.

20. I had no evil intent when I belatedly presented Andrew with the PWP covering his initial period of employment in the Honolulu District. The Investigator has informed me that Andrew Lopez has an objection to element 4 requiring him to provide training in that he claims not to have been given the choice of training to provide. The truth is that I did ask Andrew whether he had preferences as to the training he would provide but Andrew did not voice any. I would not deny a person's interest in developing training. The only restriction to his choice of training was that he could not train in an area where other Senior Inspectors were already providing training. I